IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 22457 of 2004

Between:

Yakkala Rajasekhar S/o.Sri Y.Sambasiva Rao
R/o.29 1st D.Main, 8th Cross M.V.Nagar,
Rama Murthy Nagar, Bangalore.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Vice Chancellor, Nagarjuna University Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur.
2 The Controller of Excamination Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur.

.RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ order or order or direction, to declare the action of the respondent Nos.1 and 2 in not releasing the marks Memo of the petitioner vide Registered No.99B15013 for M.B.A Subject Management April 2004 examiantion held on 12.4.2004 as being arbitrary, illegal and violative of natural justice and direct the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to release the marks memo in the interest of justice and pass such order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.B.V.V.S.MURTHY

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.T.S.HARNATH

The Court at the stage of admission made the following :

ORDER:

The present writ petition is filed questioning the action of the respondents in not releasing the marks memo of the petitioner with registration No.99B15013 for M.B.A. course for the examination held on 12-4-2004.

The petitioner claims to have prosecuted his M.B.A course from Pedanandipadu College and appeared for Paper IV of first year M.B.A. course on 12-4-2004, after paying the required fees. That the marks memo of the petitioner was not received by the subject college and on enquiries, the petitioner came to know that his marks memo was withheld without any reason. It is also stated that the petitioner has made an representation to the second respondent on 10-8-2004, but no action was taken and the same remained unanswered. Hence, the present writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for respondent. Both counsel agreed for disposal of the writ petition at the admission stage.

Since, the representation of the petitioner is pending with the second respondent, without going into the merits of the matter, the writ petition is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dt 10-8-2004 and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, within four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. No costs.

N.V.RAMANA,J

7-12-2004

TVK

To

1 The Vice Chancellor, Nagarjuna University Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur.
2 The Controller of Excamination Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur.

3. Two CD copies.